arXiv:1411.5386v1 [quant-ph] 19 Nov 2014

On n-partite superactivation of quantum channel capacities

M.E. Shirokov*

Abstract

A generalization of the superactivation of quantum channel capacities to the case of $n > 2$ channels is considered. An explicit example of such superactivation for the 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity is constructed for $n = 3$.

Some implications of this example and its reformulation on terms of quantum measurements are described.

1 General observations

The superactivation of quantum channel capacities is one of the most impressive quantum effects having no classical counterpart. It means that the particular capacity C of the tensor product of two quantum channels Φ_1 and Φ_2 may be positive despite the same capacity of each of these channels is zero, i.e.

$$C(\Phi_1 \otimes \Phi_2) > 0 \quad \text{while} \quad C(\Phi_1) = C(\Phi_2) = 0. \tag{1}$$

This effect was originally observed by G.Smith and J.Yard for the case of quantum ε-error capacity [12]. Then the possibility of superactivation of other capacities, in particular, zero-error capacities was shown [2, 3, 4, 11].

It seems reasonable to consider the generalization of the above effect to the case of $n > 2$ channels $\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_n$ consisting in the following property

$$C(\Phi_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_n) > 0 \quad \text{while} \quad C(\Phi_{i_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{i_k}) = 0 \tag{2}$$

for any proper subset $\Phi_{i_1}, ..., \Phi_{i_k}$ $(k < n)$ of the set $\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_n$. This property can be called *n-partite superactivation* of the capacity C.

*Steklov Mathematical Institute, RAS, Moscow, email:msh@mi.ras.ru

Property (2) means that all the channels $\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_n$ are required to transmit (classical or quantum) information by using the protocol corresponding to the capacity C, i.e. excluding any channel from the set $\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_n$ makes other channels useless for information transmission.

The obvious difficulty in finding channels $\Phi_1, ..., \Phi_n$ demonstrating property (2) for given capacity C consists in necessity to prove the vanishing of $C(\Phi_{i_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{i_k})$ for any subset $\Phi_{i_1}, ..., \Phi_{i_k}$.

If C is the 1-shot capacity of some protocol of information transmission and $\Phi_i = \Phi$ for all $i = \overline{1,n}$ then (2) means that the n-shot capacity of this protocol is positive while the corresponding $(n-1)$-shot capacity is zero.

In [10] it is shown how to construct for any n a channel Ψ_n such that

$$\bar{Q}_0(\Psi_n^{\otimes n}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Q}_0(\Psi_n^{\otimes m}) > 0, \tag{3}$$

where $\bar{Q}_0$ is the 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity and m is a natural number satisfying the inequality $n/m \leq 2\ln(3/2)/\pi$ (implying $m > n$). It follows that there is $\tilde{n} > n$ not exceeding m such that (2) holds for $n = \tilde{n}$, $C = \bar{Q}_0$ and $\Phi_1 = ... = \Phi_{\tilde{n}} = \Psi_n$. Unfortunately, we can not specify the number $\tilde{n}$ in that construction.

In this paper we modify the example in [10] (by extending its noncommutative graph) to construct a family of channels $\{\Phi_\theta\}$ with $d_A = 4$ and $d_E = 3$ having the following property

$$\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_3}) > 0 \quad \text{while} \quad \bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_i} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_j}) = 0 \quad \forall\, i \neq j, \tag{4}$$

where $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ are positive numbers such that $\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3 = \pi$. Thus, the channels $\Phi_{\theta_1}, \Phi_{\theta_2}, \Phi_{\theta_3}$ demonstrate the 3-partite superactivation of the 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity.

Property (4) means that all the channels Φ_{θ_i} and all the bipartite channels $\Phi_{\theta_i} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_j}$ have no ideal (noiseless or reversible) subchannels, but the tripartite channel $\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_3}$ has.

By using the observation in [9, Section 4] superactivation property (4) can be reformulated in terms of quantum measurements theory as the existence of quantum observables $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_1}, \mathcal{M}_{\theta_2}, \mathcal{M}_{\theta_3}$ such that all the observables $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_i}$ and all the bipartite observables $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_i} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\theta_j}$ have no indistinguishable subspaces but the tripartite observable $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_1} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\theta_2} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\theta_3}$ has.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\Phi : \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be a quantum channel, i.e. a completely positive trace-preserving linear map [6, 8]. It has the Kraus representation

$$\Phi(\rho) = \sum_k V_k \rho V_k^*, \tag{5}$$

where V_k are linear operators from $\mathcal{H}_A$ into $\mathcal{H}_B$ such that $\sum_k V_k^* V_k = I_{\mathcal{H}_A}$. The minimal number of summands in such representation is called *Choi rank* of Φ and is denoted d_E (while $d_A \doteq \dim \mathcal{H}_A$ and $d_B \doteq \dim \mathcal{H}_B$).

The 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi)$ of a channel Φ is defined as $\sup_{\mathcal{H} \in q_0(\Phi)} \log_2 \dim \mathcal{H}$, where $q_0(\Phi)$ is the set of all subspaces $\mathcal{H}_0$ of $\mathcal{H}_A$ on which the channel Φ is perfectly reversible (in the sense that there is a channel Θ such that $\Theta(\Phi(\rho)) = \rho$ for all states ρ supported by $\mathcal{H}_0$). Any subspace $\mathcal{H}_0 \in q_0(\Phi)$ is called *error correcting code* for the channel Φ [5, 6].

The (asymptotic) quantum zero-error capacity is defined by regularization: $Q_0(\Phi) = \sup_n n^{-1} \bar{Q}_0(\Phi^{\otimes n})$ [1, 3, 5].

The quantum zero-error capacity of a channel Φ is determined by its *noncommutative graph* $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$, which can be defined as the subspace of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ spanned by the operators $V_k^* V_l$, where V_k are operators from any Kraus representation (5) of Φ [5]. In particular, the Knill-Laflamme error-correcting condition [7] implies the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *A set $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^d$ of unit orthogonal vectors in $\mathcal{H}_A$ is a basis of error-correcting code for a channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ if and only if*

$$\langle \varphi_l | A | \varphi_k \rangle = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \langle \varphi_l | A | \varphi_l \rangle = \langle \varphi_k | A | \varphi_k \rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{L},\ \forall k \neq l, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathfrak{L}$ is any subset of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ such that $\operatorname{lin}\mathfrak{L} = \mathcal{G}(\Phi)$.

Since a subspace $\mathfrak{L}$ of the algebra $\mathfrak{M}_n$ of $n \times n$ matrices is a noncommutative graph of a particular channel if and only if

$$\mathfrak{L} \text{ is symmetric } (\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{L}^*) \text{ and contains the unit matrix} \tag{7}$$

(see Lemma 2 in [4] or the Appendix in [9]), Lemma 1 shows that one can "construct" a channel Φ with $\dim \mathcal{H}_A = n$ having positive (correspondingly, zero) 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity by taking a subspace $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathfrak{M}_n$ satisfying (7) for which the following condition is valid (correspondingly, not valid)

$$\exists \varphi, \psi \in [\mathbb{C}^n]_1 \text{ s.t. } \langle \psi | A | \varphi \rangle = 0 \text{ and } \langle \varphi | A | \varphi \rangle = \langle \psi | A | \psi \rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{L}, \tag{8}$$

where $[\mathbb{C}^n]_1$ is the unit sphere of $\mathbb{C}^n$.

3 Example of 3-partite superactivation

For given $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$ consider the 8-D subspace

$$\mathfrak{N}_\theta = \left\{ M = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & e & f \\ c & d & f & \bar{\gamma} e \\ g & h & a & b \\ h & \gamma g & c & d \end{bmatrix}, \ a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{C} \right\} \tag{9}$$

of $\mathfrak{M}_4$ satisfying condition (7), where $\gamma = \exp[\,\mathrm{i}\theta\,]$. This subspace is an extension of the 4-D subspace $\mathfrak{L}_\theta$ used in [10], i.e. $\mathfrak{L}_\theta \subset \mathfrak{N}_\theta$ for each θ.[1]

Denote by $\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\theta$ the set of all channels whose noncommutative graph coincides with $\mathfrak{N}_\theta$. In [9, the Appendix] it is shown how to explicitly construct pseudo-diagonal channels in $\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\theta$ with $d_A = 4$ and $d_E \geq 3$ (since $\dim \mathfrak{N}_\theta = 8 \leq 3^2$).

Theorem 1. *Let Φ_θ be a channel in $\widehat{\mathfrak{N}}_\theta$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary.*

A) $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_\theta) > 0$ *if and only if* $\theta = \pi$ *and* $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_\pi) = 1$.

B) *If* $\theta_1 + \ldots + \theta_n = \pi (\mathrm{mod}\, 2\pi)$ *then* $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{\theta_n}) > 0$ *and 2-D error-correcting code for the channel $\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{\theta_n}$ is spanned by the vectors*

$$|\varphi\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\,|1\ldots1\rangle + \mathrm{i}\,|2\ldots2\rangle\,],\ |\psi\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\,|3\ldots3\rangle + \mathrm{i}\,|4\ldots4\rangle\,], \tag{10}$$

where $\{|1\rangle, \ldots, |4\rangle\}$ is the canonical basis in $\mathbb{C}^4$.

C$_2$) *If* $|\theta_1| + |\theta_2| < \pi$ *then* $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2}) = 0$.

C$_\mathrm{n}$) *If* $|\theta_1| + \ldots + |\theta_n| \leq 2\ln(3/2)$ *then* $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{\theta_n}) = 0$.

Assertion C$_2$ is the main progress of this theorem in comparison with Theorem 1 in [10]. It complements assertion B with $n = 2$. It is the proof of assertion C$_2$ that motivates the extension $\mathfrak{L}_\theta \to \mathfrak{N}_\theta$.

Remark 1. Since assertion C$_\mathrm{n}$ is proved by using quite coarse estimates, the other assertions of Theorem 1 make it reasonable to conjecture validity of the following strengthened version:

C$^*_\mathrm{n}$) *If* $|\theta_1| + \ldots + |\theta_n| < \pi$ *then* $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{\theta_n}) = 0$.

The below proof of C$_2$ shows difficulty of the direct proof of this conjecture.

[1] In contrast to this paper $\gamma = \exp[\,\mathrm{i}\theta/2\,]$ is used in [10].

Theorem 1 implies the following example of 3-partite superactivation of 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity.

Corollary 1. *Let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ be positive numbers such that $\theta_1+\theta_2+\theta_3 = \pi$. Then*

$$\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_3}) > 0 \quad \textit{while} \quad \bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_i} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_j}) = 0 \quad \forall\, i \neq j.$$

2-D error-correcting code for the channel $\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_3}$ is spanned by the vectors

$$|\varphi\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,[\,|111\rangle + \mathrm{i}\,|222\rangle\,]\,,\ |\psi\rangle = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,[\,|333\rangle + \mathrm{i}\,|444\rangle\,]. \tag{11}$$

If conjecture C_n^* in Remark 1 is valid for some $n > 2$ then the similar assertion holds for $n+1$ channels $\Phi_{\theta_1}, \ldots, \Phi_{\theta_{n+1}}$. This would give an example of $(n+1)$-partite superactivation of 1-shot quantum zero-error capacity.

For each θ one can choose (non-uniquely) a basis $\{M_k^\theta\}_{k=1}^8$ of the subspace $\mathfrak{N}_\theta$ consisting of positive operators such that $\sum_{k=1}^8 M_k^\theta = I_{\mathcal{H}_A}$ (since the subspace $\mathfrak{N}_\theta$ satisfies condition (7), see [9]). This basis can be considered as a quantum observable $\mathcal{M}_\theta$. By using Proposition 1 in [9] and Lemma 1 Corollary 1 can be reformulated in terms of theory of quantum measurements.

Corollary 2. *Let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ be positive numbers such that $\theta_1+\theta_2+\theta_3 = \pi$. Then all the observables $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_i}$ and all the bipartite observables $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_i} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\theta_j}$ have no indistinguishable subspaces but the tripartite observable $\mathcal{M}_{\theta_1} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\theta_2} \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\theta_3}$ has indistinguishable subspace spanned by the vectors (11).*[2]

Note also that Theorem 1 implies the following example of superactivation of 2-shot quantum zero-error capacity.

Corollary 3. *Let θ_1, θ_2 be positive numbers such that $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = \pi/2$. Then*

$$\bar{Q}_0\left([\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2}]^{\otimes 2}\right) > 0 \quad \textit{while} \quad \bar{Q}_0\left(\Phi_{\theta_1}^{\otimes 2}\right) = \bar{Q}_0\left(\Phi_{\theta_2}^{\otimes 2}\right) = \bar{Q}_0\left(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \Phi_{\theta_2}\right) = 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 1. The equality $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_\theta) = 0$ for $\theta \neq \pi$, the inequality $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_\pi) \leq 1$ and assertion C_n follows from Theorem 1 in [10], since the inclusion $\mathfrak{L}_\theta \subset \mathfrak{N}_\theta$ implies $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_{\theta_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Phi_{\theta_n}) \leq \bar{Q}_0(\Psi_{\theta_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes \Psi_{\theta_n})$ for any channels $\Psi_{\theta_1} \in \widehat{\mathfrak{L}}_{\theta_1}, \ldots, \Psi_{\theta_n} \in \widehat{\mathfrak{L}}_{\theta_n}$.

[2] We call a subspace $\mathcal{H}_0$ *indistinguishable* for an observable $\mathcal{M}$ if application of $\mathcal{M}$ to all states supported by $\mathcal{H}_0$ leads to the same outcomes probability distribution.

To prove that $\bar{Q}_0(\Phi_\pi) \geq 1$ it suffices to show, by using Lemma 1, that the vectors $|\varphi\rangle = [1, \mathrm{i}, 0, 0]^\top$ and $|\psi\rangle = [0, 0, 1, \mathrm{i}]^\top$ generate error-correcting code for the channel Φ_π.

B) Let $M_1 \in \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_1}, \ldots, M_n \in \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_n}$ be arbitrary, $X = M_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes M_n$ and φ, ψ be the vectors defined in (10). By Lemma 1 it suffices to show that

$$\langle\psi|X|\varphi\rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle\psi|X|\psi\rangle = \langle\varphi|X|\varphi\rangle. \tag{12}$$

Let $a_k, b_k, ..., h_k$ be elements of the matrix M_k. We have

$$2\langle\psi|X|\varphi\rangle = \langle 3\ldots 3|X|1\ldots 1\rangle + \mathrm{i}\langle 3\ldots 3|X|2\ldots 2\rangle - \mathrm{i}\langle 4\ldots 4|X|1\ldots 1\rangle$$

$$+\langle 4\ldots 4|X|2\ldots 2\rangle = g_1\ldots g_n(1+\gamma_1\ldots\gamma_n) + h_1\ldots h_n(\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{i}) = 0,$$

since $\gamma_1\ldots\gamma_n = -1$ by the condition $\theta_1 + \ldots + \theta_n = \pi(\mathrm{mod}\, 2\pi)$,

$$2\langle\varphi|X|\varphi\rangle = \langle 1\ldots 1|X|1\ldots 1\rangle + \mathrm{i}\langle 1\ldots 1|X|2\ldots 2\rangle - \mathrm{i}\langle 2\ldots 2|X|1\ldots 1\rangle$$

$$+\langle 2\ldots 2|X|2\ldots 2\rangle = a_1\ldots a_n + \mathrm{i}\,(b_1\ldots b_n - c_1\ldots c_n) + d_1\ldots d_n$$

and

$$2\langle\psi|X|\psi\rangle = \langle 3\ldots 3|X|3\ldots 3\rangle + \mathrm{i}\langle 3\ldots 3|X|4\ldots 4\rangle - \mathrm{i}\langle 4\ldots 4|X|3\ldots 3\rangle$$

$$+\langle 4\ldots 4|X|4\ldots 4\rangle = a_1\ldots a_n + \mathrm{i}\,(b_1\ldots b_n - c_1\ldots c_n) + d_1\ldots d_n.$$

Thus the both equalities in (12) are valid.

C_2) To prove this assertion we have to show that the subspace $\mathfrak{N}_{\theta_1} \otimes \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_2}$ does not satisfy condition (8) if $|\theta_1| + |\theta_2| < \pi$. In the case $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$ this follows from assertion $\mathrm{C_n}$. So, we may assume, by symmetry, that $\theta_2 \neq 0$.

Throughout the proof we will use the isomorphism

$$\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \ni x \otimes y \;\leftrightarrow\; [x_1 y, \ldots, x_n y]^\top \in \underbrace{\mathbb{C}^m \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{C}^m}_{n}$$

and the corresponding isomorphism

$$\mathfrak{M}_n \otimes \mathfrak{M}_m \ni A \otimes B \;\leftrightarrow\; [a_{ij}B] \in \mathfrak{M}_{nm}. \tag{13}$$

Let U_1, U_2, V_1, V_2 be the unitary operators in $\mathbb{C}^2$ determined (in the canonical basis) by the matrices

$$U_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_2 = V_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We will identify $\mathbb{C}^4$ with $\mathbb{C}^2 \oplus \mathbb{C}^2$. So, arbitrary matrices $M_1 \in \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_1}$ and $M_2 \in \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_2}$ can be represented as follows

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & e_1U_1^* + f_1U_2^* \\ g_1U_1 + h_1U_2 & A_1 \end{bmatrix}, \; M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} A_2 & e_2V_1^* + f_2V_2^* \\ g_2V_1 + h_2V_2 & A_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

or, according to (13), as

$$M_1 = I_2 \otimes A_1 + |2\rangle\langle 1| \otimes [g_1U_1 + h_1U_2] + |1\rangle\langle 2| \otimes [e_1U_1^* + f_1U_2^*]$$

and

$$M_2 = I_2 \otimes A_2 + |2\rangle\langle 1| \otimes [g_2V_1 + h_2V_2] + |1\rangle\langle 2| \otimes [e_2V_1^* + f_2V_2^*],$$

where A_1 and A_2 are arbitrary matrices in $\mathfrak{M}_2$.

Assume the existence of orthogonal unit vectors φ and ψ in $\mathbb{C}^4 \otimes \mathbb{C}^4$ such that

$$\langle\psi|M_1 \otimes M_2|\varphi\rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle\psi|M_1 \otimes M_2|\psi\rangle = \langle\varphi|M_1 \otimes M_2|\varphi\rangle \tag{14}$$

for all $M_1 \in \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_1}$ and $M_2 \in \mathfrak{N}_{\theta_2}$.

By using the above representations of M_1 and M_2 we have

$$M_1 \otimes M_2 = [I_2 \otimes I_2] \otimes [A_1 \otimes A_2] + [I_2 \otimes |2\rangle\langle 1|] \otimes [A_1 \otimes [g_2V_1 + h_2V_2]] +$$

$$[I_2 \otimes |1\rangle\langle 2|] \otimes [A_1 \otimes [e_2V_1^* + f_2V_2^*]] + [|2\rangle\langle 1| \otimes I_2] \otimes [[g_1U_1 + h_1U_2] \otimes A_2] + ...$$

Since $\mathfrak{M}_2 \otimes \mathfrak{M}_2 = \mathfrak{M}_4$, by choosing $e_i = f_i = g_i = h_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, we obtain from (14) that

$$\langle\psi|I_4 \otimes A|\varphi\rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle\psi|I_4 \otimes A|\psi\rangle = \langle\varphi|I_4 \otimes A|\varphi\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_4.$$

According to (13) we have

$$I_4 \otimes A = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\varphi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad |\psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \\ y_4 \end{bmatrix},$$

where x_i, y_i are vectors in $\mathbb{C}^4$. So, the above relations can be written as the following ones

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4}\langle y_i|A|x_i\rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{4}\langle y_i|A|y_i\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{4}\langle x_i|A|x_i\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_4$$

which are equivalent to the operator equalities

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4}|y_i\rangle\langle x_i| = 0. \tag{15}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4}|y_i\rangle\langle y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{4}|x_i\rangle\langle x_i| \tag{16}$$

By choosing $e_i = f_i = g_1 = h_1 = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, $A_2 = 0$, $(g_2, h_2) = (1, 0)$ and $(g_2, h_2) = (0, 1)$ we obtain from (14) that

$$\langle\psi|[I_2 \otimes |2\rangle\langle 1|] \otimes [A_1 \otimes V_k]|\varphi\rangle = 0$$

and

$$\langle\psi|[I_2 \otimes |2\rangle\langle 1|] \otimes [A_1 \otimes V_k]|\psi\rangle = \langle\varphi|[I_2 \otimes |2\rangle\langle 1|] \otimes [A_1 \otimes V_k]|\varphi\rangle$$

for all A_1 in $\mathfrak{M}_2$ and $k = 1, 2$. According to (13) we have

$$[I_2 \otimes |2\rangle\langle 1|] \otimes [A_1 \otimes V_k] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A_1 \otimes V_k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A_1 \otimes V_k & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and hence the above equalities imply

$$\langle y_2|A \otimes V_k|x_1\rangle + \langle y_4|A \otimes V_k|x_3\rangle = 0 \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2, \tag{17}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle y_2|A \otimes V_k|y_1\rangle + \langle y_4|A \otimes V_k|y_3\rangle = \\ &\langle x_2|A \otimes V_k|x_1\rangle + \langle x_4|A \otimes V_k|x_3\rangle \qquad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Similarly, by choosing $e_i = f_i = g_2 = h_2 = 0$, $i = 1, 2$, $A_1 = 0$, $(g_1, h_1) = (1, 0)$ and $(g_1, h_1) = (0, 1)$ we obtain from (14) the equalities

$$\langle y_3|U_k \otimes A|x_1\rangle + \langle y_4|U_k \otimes A|x_2\rangle = 0, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2, \tag{19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle y_3|U_k \otimes A|y_1\rangle + \langle y_4|U_k \otimes A|y_2\rangle = \\ &\langle x_3|U_k \otimes A|x_1\rangle + \langle x_4|U_k \otimes A|x_2\rangle, \qquad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

By the symmetry of condition (14) with respect to φ and ψ relations (17) and (19) imply respectively

$$\langle x_2|A \otimes V_k|y_1\rangle + \langle x_4|A \otimes V_k|y_3\rangle = 0 \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2, \tag{21}$$

and

$$\langle x_3|U_k \otimes A|y_1\rangle + \langle x_4|U_k \otimes A|y_2\rangle = 0, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2. \tag{22}$$

Finally, by choosing $A_1 = A_2 = 0$ and appropriate values of e_i, f_i, g_i, h_i, $i = 1, 2$, one can obtain from (14) the following equalities

$$\langle y_4|U_k \otimes V_l\,|x_1\rangle = \langle x_4|U_k \otimes V_l\,|y_1\rangle = 0 \qquad k, l = 1, 2, \tag{23}$$

$$\langle y_4|U_k \otimes V_l\,|y_1\rangle = \langle x_4|U_k \otimes V_l\,|x_1\rangle, \qquad k, l = 1, 2, \tag{24}$$

$$\langle y_3|U_k \otimes V_l^*|x_2\rangle = \langle x_3|U_k \otimes V_l^*|y_2\rangle = 0 \qquad k, l = 1, 2, \tag{25}$$

$$\langle y_3|U_k \otimes V_l^*|y_2\rangle = \langle x_3|U_k \otimes V_l^*|x_2\rangle, \qquad k, l = 1, 2. \tag{26}$$

We will prove below that the system (15)-(26) has no nontrivial solutions.

We will use the following lemmas.

Lemma 2. A) *Equations (15) and (16) imply that all the vectors* x_i, y_i, $i = \overline{1, 4}$, *lie in some 2-D subspace of* $\mathbb{C}^4$.

B) *If* $x_{i_0} = y_{i_0} = 0$ *for some* i_0 *then equations (15) and (16) imply that all the vectors* x_i, y_i, $i = \overline{1, 4}$, *are collinear.*

Proof. A) Consider the 4×4 - matrices

$$X = [\langle x_i|x_j\rangle], \quad Y = [\langle y_i|y_j\rangle], \quad Z = [\langle x_i|y_j\rangle].$$

It is easy to see that (15) implies $XY = 0$ while (16) shows that $X^2 = ZZ^*$ and $Y^2 = Z^*Z$. Hence $\mathrm{rank}X = \mathrm{rank}Y \leq 2$.

Since (16) implies that the sets $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^4$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^4$ have the same linear hull, the above inequality shows that this linear hull has dimension ≤ 2.

B) This assertion is proved similarly, since the same argumentation with 3×3 - matrices X, Y, Z implies $\mathrm{rank}X = \mathrm{rank}Y \leq 1$. □

Lemma 3. A) *The condition*

$$\langle z_4 | U_k \otimes V_l | z_1 \rangle = 0 \qquad k, l = 1, 2, \tag{27}$$

holds if and only if the pair (z_1, z_4) *has one of the following forms:*

1) $z_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix}$, $z_4 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix}$;

2) $z_1 = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix}$, $z_4 = \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix}$;

3) $z_1 = a \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix} + b \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix}$, $z_4 = c \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} + d \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix}$;

4) $z_1 = h \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$, $z_4 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix}$;

5) $z_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix}$, $z_4 = h \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix}$;

where $\mu_k = \sqrt{\gamma_k}$, $k = 1, 2$, *and* $a, b, c, d, h \in \mathbb{C}$, $s = \pm 1$, $t = \pm 1$.

B) *Validity of (23) and (24) for vectors* x_i, y_i, $i = 1, 4$, *implies*

$$\langle y_4 | U_k \otimes V_l | y_1 \rangle = \langle x_4 | U_k \otimes V_l | x_1 \rangle = 0.$$

Lemma 4. A) *The condition*

$$\langle z_3 | U_k \otimes V_l^* | z_2 \rangle = 0 \qquad k, l = 1, 2, \tag{28}$$

holds if and only if the pair (z_2, z_3) *has one of the following forms:*

1) $z_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix};$

2) $z_2 = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix};$

3) $z_2 = a \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix} + b \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = c \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix} + d \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix};$

4) $z_2 = h \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix};$

5) $z_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = h \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix};$

where $\mu_k = \sqrt{\gamma_k}$, $k = 1, 2$, *and* $a, b, c, d, h \in \mathbb{C}$, $s = \pm 1$, $t = \pm 1$.

B) *Validity of (25) and (26) for vectors* x_i, y_i, $i = 2, 3$, *implies*

$$\langle y_3 | U_k \otimes V_l^* | y_2 \rangle = \langle x_3 | U_k \otimes V_l^* | x_2 \rangle = 0.$$

Lemmas 3 and 4 are proved in the Appendix.

Lemma 5. *Let* $|\theta_1| + |\theta_2| < \pi$ *then*

A) $\langle x|U_1|x\rangle \neq 0$ *and* $\langle x|V_1|x\rangle \neq 0$ *for any nonzero* $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$*;*

B) $\langle y|U_1 \otimes V_1|y\rangle \neq 0$ *and* $\langle y|U_1 \otimes V_1^*|y\rangle \neq 0$ *for any nonzero* $y \in \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$.

Proof. A) Let $|x\rangle = [x_1, x_2]^\top \neq 0$ then $\langle x|U_1|x\rangle = |x_1|^2 + \gamma_1 |x_2|^2 \neq 0$ and $\langle x|V_1|x\rangle = |x_1|^2 + \gamma_2 |x_2|^2 \neq 0$, since $\theta_1, \theta_2 \neq \pi$.

B) Since $U_1 \otimes V_1 = \mathrm{diag}\{1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_1\gamma_2\}$, the equality $\langle y|U_1 \otimes V_1|y\rangle = 0$ for vector $|y\rangle = [y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4]^\top$ means that $|y_1|^2 + |y_2|^2\gamma_2 + |y_3|^2\gamma_1 + |y_4|^2\gamma_1\gamma_2 = 0$. By the condition $|\theta_1| + |\theta_2| < \pi$ the numbers $0, 1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_1\gamma_2$ are extreme points of a convex polygon in complex plane, so the last equality can be valid only if $y_i = 0$ for all i.

Similarly one can show that $\langle y|U_1 \otimes V_1^*|y\rangle = 0$ implies $y = 0$. □

Lemma 6. *Let p and q be complex numbers such that $|p|^2+|q|^2=1$. If $\{|x_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^4$ and $\{|y_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^4$ satisfy the system (15)-(26) then $\{|px_i-qy_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^4$ and $\{|\bar{q}x_i+\bar{p}y_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^4$ also satisfy the system (15)-(26).*

Proof. It suffices to note that the condition

$$\langle\varphi|A|\psi\rangle=\langle\psi|A|\varphi\rangle=\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle-\langle\varphi|A|\varphi\rangle=0$$

is invariant under the rotation $|\varphi\rangle\mapsto p|\varphi\rangle-q|\psi\rangle,\ |\psi\rangle\mapsto\bar{q}|\varphi\rangle+\bar{p}|\psi\rangle$. □

Lemma 7. *If $|\theta_1|+|\theta_2|<\pi$ then the system (15)-(26) has no nontrivial solution of the form $|x_i\rangle=\alpha_i|z\rangle$ and $|y_i\rangle=\beta_i|z\rangle$, $i=\overline{1,4}$.*

Proof. Assume that $|x_i\rangle=\alpha_i|z\rangle$ and $|y_i\rangle=\beta_i|z\rangle$, $i=\overline{1,4}$, form a nontrivial solution of the system (15)-(26). Then (15) implies that $|\alpha\rangle=[\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_4]^\top$ and $|\beta\rangle=[\beta_1,\dots,\beta_4]^\top$ are orthogonal nonzero vectors of the same norm. By Lemma 5B it follows from (23) and (25) that

$$\alpha_1\beta_4=\alpha_4\beta_1=\alpha_2\beta_3=\alpha_3\beta_2=0. \tag{29}$$

If $|\alpha_i|+|\beta_i|>0$ for all i then we may consider by Lemma 6 that $\alpha_i\neq0$ for all i and hence (29) implies $\beta_i=0$ for all i, i.e. $|\beta\rangle=0$.

Assume that $\alpha_1=\beta_1=0$ and consider the following two cases.

1) If $\alpha_4=\beta_4=0$ then the condition $\langle\beta|\alpha\rangle=0$ implies $|\alpha_i|+|\beta_i|>0$ for $i=2,3$ and we may consider by Lemma 6 that $\alpha_i\neq0$ for $i=2,3$. Hence (29) implies $\beta_i=0$ for $i=2,3$ and hence $|\beta\rangle=0$.

2) If $|\alpha_4|+|\beta_4|>0$ then we may consider by Lemma 6 that $\alpha_4\neq0$. By Lemma 5B it follows from (21) with $A=U_1$ and (22) with $A=V_1$ that $\alpha_4\beta_2=\alpha_4\beta_3=0$, which implies $\beta_2=\beta_3=0$. Hence the condition $\langle\beta|\alpha\rangle=0$ can be valid only if $|\beta\rangle=0$.

By the similar way one can show that the assumption $\alpha_i=\beta_i=0$ for $i=2,3,4$ leads to a contradiction. □

Assume now that the collections $\{x_i\}_1^4$ and $\{y_i\}_1^4$ form a nontrivial solution of the system (15)-(26).

If $x_i\nparallel y_i$ for some i then (23)-(26) and Lemmas 3B, 4B imply

$$\langle y_{5-i}|W_i|x_i\rangle=\langle x_{5-i}|W_i|y_i\rangle=\langle x_{5-i}|W_i|x_i\rangle=\langle y_{5-i}|W_i|y_i\rangle=0,$$

where $W_1=U_1\otimes V_1$, $W_2=U_1\otimes V_1^*$, $W_3=U_1^*\otimes V_1$, $W_4=U_1^*\otimes V_1^*$. By Lemma 2A we have $x_{5-i},y_{5-i}\in\operatorname{lin}\{x_i,y_i\}$, so the above equalities show that

$\langle x_{5-i}|W_i|x_{5-i}\rangle = \langle y_{5-i}|W_i|y_{5-i}\rangle = 0$. Lemma 5B implies $x_{5-i} = y_{5-i} = 0$, which contradicts to the assumption $x_i \nparallel y_i$ by Lemma 2B.

Thus, $x_i \parallel y_i$ for all $i = \overline{1,4}$. By Lemma 7 we may assume in what follows that

$$|x_i\rangle = \alpha_i|z_i\rangle \text{ and } |y_i\rangle = \beta_i|z_i\rangle, \text{ where } |z_i\rangle \text{ are non-collinear vectors}^3. \quad (30)$$

Then Lemma 2B implies $|\alpha_i|+|\beta_i| > 0$, $i = \overline{1,4}$, and equations (15), (16) can be rewritten as follows

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} \bar{\beta}_i\alpha_i|z_i\rangle\langle z_i| = 0, \quad (31)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} \left[|\beta_i|^2 - |\alpha_i|^2\right]|z_i\rangle\langle z_i| = 0. \quad (32)$$

By Lemma 6 we may assume that $\beta_1 = 0$ and hence $\alpha_1 \neq 0$. There are two cases:

1) If $\beta_i\alpha_i \neq 0$ for all $i > 1$ then (31) and Lemma 8 in the Appendix imply $z_2 \parallel z_3 \parallel z_4$. Then it follows from (32) that

$$|\alpha_1|^2|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| + [\ldots]|z_2\rangle\langle z_2| = 0$$

and hence $z_1 \parallel z_2 \parallel z_3 \parallel z_4$ contradicting to the assumption (30).

2) If there is $k > 1$ such that $\beta_k\alpha_k = 0$ then (31) implies that either $\beta_i\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $\beta_j\alpha_j \neq 0$ or $\beta_i\alpha_i = \beta_j\alpha_j = 0$, where i and $j > i$ are complementary indexes to 1 and k.

If $\beta_i\alpha_i \neq 0$ and $\beta_j\alpha_j \neq 0$ then it follows from (31) that $z_i \parallel z_j$ and (32) implies

$$|\alpha_1|^2|z_1\rangle\langle z_1| + p|z_k\rangle\langle z_k| + [\ldots]|z_i\rangle\langle z_i| = 0,$$

where p is a nonzero number (equal either to $|\alpha_k|^2$ or to $-|\beta_k|^2$). Hence $z_1 \parallel z_k$ by Lemma 8 in the Appendix.

Thus $z_1 \parallel z_k$ and $z_i \parallel z_j$. By Lemma 5B it follows from (23) and (25) that $k \neq 4$ and $(i,j) \neq (2,3)$. So, we have only two possibilities:

a) $k = 2, i = 3, j = 4$. In this case $z_3 \parallel z_4$ and (21) with $A = U_1$ implies

$$\bar{\alpha}_4\beta_3\langle z_4|U_1 \otimes V_1|z_3\rangle = -\bar{\alpha}_2\beta_1\langle z_2|U_1 \otimes V_1|z_1\rangle = 0 \quad (\text{since } \beta_1 = 0).$$

[3]In the sense that all the vectors $|z_i\rangle$, $i = \overline{1,4}$, are not collinear to each other, but some two of them may be collinear.

Hence Lemma 5 shows that $\alpha_4\beta_3 = 0$ contradicting to the assumption.

b) $k = 3, i = 2, j = 4$. In this case $z_2 \parallel z_4$ and (22) with $A = V_1$ implies

$$\bar{\alpha}_4\beta_2\langle z_4|U_1 \otimes V_1|z_2\rangle = -\bar{\alpha}_3\beta_1\langle z_3|U_1 \otimes V_1|z_1\rangle = 0 \quad (\text{since } \beta_1 = 0).$$

Hence Lemma 5B shows that $\alpha_4\beta_2 = 0$ contradicting to the assumption.

So, we necessarily have $\beta_i\alpha_i = 0$ for all $i = \overline{1,4}$. Since the vectors $z_1, \ldots, z_4$ are not collinear by assumption (30), equality (32) and Lemma 2B imply that there are two nonzero α_i and two nonzero β_i. Thus, we have (up to permutation) the following cases

$$\text{a) } |\varphi\rangle,|\psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ y_3 \\ y_4 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \text{b) } |\varphi\rangle,|\psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \\ x_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ y_2 \\ 0 \\ y_4 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \text{c) } |\varphi\rangle,|\psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $x_1 \nparallel x_k$ and $y_i \nparallel y_j$ (since otherwise (32) implies $x_1 \parallel x_k \parallel y_i \parallel y_j$).

Show first that case c) is not possible. It follows from (17) with $A = U_1$ and (19) with $A = V_1$ that

$$\langle y_2|U_1 \otimes V_1|x_1\rangle = \langle y_3|U_1 \otimes V_1|x_1\rangle = 0.$$

Since $y_2 \nparallel y_3$, Lemma 2A shows that $x_1 \in \text{lin}\{y_2, y_3\}$ and the above equalities imply $\langle x_1|U_1 \otimes V_1|x_1\rangle = 0$. By Lemma 5B $x_1 = 0$.

It is more difficult to show impossibility of cases a) and b). We will consider these cases simultaneously by denoting $z_2 = x_2, z_3 = y_3$ in case a), $z_2 = y_2, z_3 = x_3$ in case b) and $z_1 = x_1, z_4 = y_4$ in the both cases. The system (15)-(26) implies the following equations:

$$|x_1\rangle\langle x_1| + |x_i\rangle\langle x_i| = |y_j\rangle\langle y_j| + |y_4\rangle\langle y_4| \tag{33}$$

where $(i, j) = (2, 3)$ in case a) and $(i, j) = (3, 2)$ in case b),

$$\langle z_3|U_k \otimes A|x_1\rangle = -\sigma_*\langle y_4|U_k \otimes A|z_2\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2, \tag{34}$$

$$\langle z_2|A \otimes V_k|x_1\rangle = +\sigma_*\langle y_4|A \otimes V_k|z_3\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,\ k = 1, 2, \tag{35}$$

where $\sigma_* = 1$ in case a) and $\sigma_* = -1$ in case b),

$$\langle y_4|U_k \otimes V_l|x_1\rangle = 0 \quad k, l = 1, 2, \tag{36}$$

$$\langle z_3|U_k \otimes V_l^*|z_2\rangle = 0 \quad k,l = 1,2. \tag{37}$$

It follows from (36) and (37) that the pairs (x_1, y_4) and (z_2, z_3) must have one of the forms 1-5 presented in part A of Lemmas 3 and 4 correspondingly.

Assume first that the both pairs (x_1, y_4) and (z_2, z_3) have forms 1-2. In this case x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 are tensor product vectors. By Lemma 9 in the Appendix (33) can be valid only in the following cases (1-4):

1) $|z_i\rangle = |p\rangle \otimes |a_i\rangle$, $i = \overline{1,4}$. It follows from (34) that

$$\langle p|U_1|p\rangle\langle a_3|A|a_1\rangle = -\sigma_*\langle p|U_1|p\rangle\langle a_4|A|a_2\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2.$$

Since $\langle p|U_1|p\rangle \neq 0$ by Lemma 5A, we have $a_1 \parallel a_2$ and $a_3 \parallel a_4$. In case a) this and (33) implies $x_1 \parallel x_2 \parallel y_3 \parallel y_4$ contradicting to assumption (30). In case b) it means $x_1 \parallel y_2$ and $x_3 \parallel y_4$. The assumption $x_1 \nparallel x_3$ and (33) show that this can be valid only if $|x_1\rangle\langle x_1| = |y_2\rangle\langle y_2|$ and $|x_3\rangle\langle x_3| = |y_4\rangle\langle y_4|$. So, this case is reduced to case 4) considered below.

2) $|z_i\rangle = |a_i\rangle \otimes |p\rangle$, $i = \overline{1,4}$. Similarly to case 1) this case is reduced to case 4) by using (35) instead of (34).

3) $|x_1\rangle\langle x_1| = |y_4\rangle\langle y_4|$ and $|z_2\rangle\langle z_2| = |z_3\rangle\langle z_3|$. This is not possible due to (36)-(37) and Lemma 5B.

4) $|x_1\rangle\langle x_1| = |y_i\rangle\langle y_i|$ and $|x_{5-i}\rangle\langle x_{5-i}| = |y_4\rangle\langle y_4|$, where $i = 3$ in case a) and $i = 2$ in case b).

If $i = 3$ then $y_3 = \alpha x_1$, $y_4 = \beta x_2$, $|\alpha| = |\beta| = 1$, and (34) with $\sigma_* = 1$ implies

$$\bar\alpha\langle x_1|U_1 \otimes A|x_1\rangle = -\bar\beta\langle x_2|U_1 \otimes A|x_2\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2. \tag{38}$$

Since x_1 and x_2 are product vectors, it follows from (38) and Lemma 5A that

$$x_1 = a \otimes p \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 = b \otimes p$$

for some nonzero vectors a, b, p. Hence (36), (37) and Lemma 5A imply

$$\langle b|U_k|a\rangle = \langle b|U_k^*|a\rangle = 0, \quad k = 1,2.$$

If $\gamma_1 \neq 1$ (i.e. $\theta_1 \neq 0$) then this can not be valid for nonzero vectors a and b. If $\gamma_1 = 1$ then (38) shows that $\bar\alpha\|a\|^2 = -\bar\beta\|b\|^2$ while (35) with $\sigma_* = 1$ and Lemma 5A imply $\bar\beta\alpha = 1$, i.e. $\alpha = \beta$.

Similarly, if $i = 2$ then by using Lemma 5A one can obtain from (35) that

$$x_1 \parallel y_2 \parallel p \otimes a \quad \text{and} \quad x_3 \parallel y_4 \parallel p \otimes b$$

for some nonzero vectors a, b, p. Hence (36), (37) and Lemma 5A imply

$$\langle b|V_k|a\rangle = \langle b|V_k^*|a\rangle = 0, \quad k = 1, 2,$$

which can not be valid for nonzero vectors a and b (since $\theta_2 \neq 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \gamma_2 \neq \bar{\gamma}_2$).

Assume now that the pair (x_1, y_4) have form 3 in Lemma 3A, i.e.

$$x_1 = a \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix} + b \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix}, \; y_4 = c \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} + d \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{bmatrix},$$

where $s = \pm 1$, and show incompatibility of the system (33)-(37) if the pair (z_2, z_3) has forms 1,2,3 in Lemma 4A. We will do this by reducing to the case of tensor product vectors x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 considered before.

1) The pair (z_2, z_3) has form 1, i.e.

$$z_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ t \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} p \\ q \end{bmatrix}, \; z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -t \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix}, \;\; t = \pm 1, \; |p| + |q| \neq 0, \; |x| + |y| \neq 0.$$

By substituting the expressions for x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 into (34) and by noting that

$$\left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ s \end{matrix} \middle| U_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right\rangle = 0, \;\; s = \pm 1, \;\; k = 1, 2 \tag{39}$$

we obtain

$$b \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \middle| U_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right\rangle = -\sigma_* \bar{c} \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \middle| U_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \right\rangle \quad \text{if } \; t = 1$$

and

$$a \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \middle| U_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right\rangle = -\sigma_* \bar{d} \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \middle| U_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \right\rangle \quad \text{if } \; t = -1.$$

Validity of this equality for all $A \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ implies

$$b \, \lambda_k^- \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right| = -\sigma_* \bar{c} \, \lambda_k^+ \left| \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right| \quad \text{if } \; t = 1$$

and

$$a \, \lambda_k^+ \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right| = -\sigma_* \bar{d} \, \lambda_k^- \left| \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right| \quad \text{if } \; t = -1,$$

where $\lambda_1^{\pm} = \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ \pm 1 \end{matrix} \middle| U_1 \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ \pm 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle = 2\mu_1^2$ and $\lambda_2^{\pm} = \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ \pm 1 \end{matrix} \middle| U_2 \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ \pm 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle = \pm 2\mu_1$. Since $\lambda_1^+ = \lambda_1^- \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2^+ = -\lambda_2^- \neq 0$, validity of the above equalities for $k = 1, 2$ implies $b = c = 0$ if $t = 1$ and $a = d = 0$ if $t = -1$. So, x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 are product vectors.

2) The pair (z_2, z_3) has form 2, i.e.

$$z_2 = \begin{bmatrix} p \\ q \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix},\ \ t = \pm 1,\ |p| + |q| \neq 0,\ |x| + |y| \neq 0.$$

By substituting the expressions for x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 into (35) and by noting that

$$\left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \middle| V_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right\rangle = 0,\ \ t = \pm 1,\ \ k = 1, 2$$

we obtain

$$a \left\langle \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \middle| V_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right\rangle = \sigma_* \bar{c} \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \middle| V_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right\rangle \quad \text{if } \ t = s$$

and

$$b \left\langle \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \middle| V_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right\rangle = \sigma_* \bar{d} \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \middle| A \middle| \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \middle| V_k \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right\rangle \quad \text{if } \ t = -s.$$

Validity of this equality for all $A \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ implies

$$a\, \nu_k^t \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \right| = \sigma_* \bar{c}\, \nu_k^{-t} \left| \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right| \quad \text{if } \ t = s$$

and

$$b\, \nu_k^t \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} p \\ q \end{matrix} \right| = \sigma_* \bar{d}\, \nu_k^{-t} \left| \begin{matrix} x \\ y \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right| \quad \text{if } \ t = -s,$$

where $\nu_1^t = \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \middle| V_1 \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right\rangle = 2\mu_2^2$ and $\nu_2^t = \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \middle| V_2 \middle| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right\rangle = 2t\mu_2$. Since $\nu_1^t = \nu_1^{-t} \neq 0$ and $\nu_2^t = -\nu_2^{-t} \neq 0$, validity of the above equalities for $k = 1, 2$ implies $a = c = 0$ if $t = s$ and $b = d = 0$ if $t = -s$. So, x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 are product vectors.

3) The pair (z_2, z_3) has form 3, i.e.

$$z_2 = p \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix} + q \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix},\ z_3 = x \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix} + y \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix},$$

where $t = \pm 1$. If we substitute the expressions for x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 into (34) (by using (39)) then the left and the right hand sides of this equality will be equal respectively to

$$\bar{x}b \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right| U_k \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right| A \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right\rangle + \bar{y}a \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right| U_k \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right| A \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right\rangle$$

and to

$$-\sigma_* \bar{c}p \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right| U_k \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right| A \left| \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right\rangle - \sigma_* \bar{d}q \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right| U_k \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_1 \\ -1 \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right| A \left| \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right\rangle .$$

So, validity of the equality for all $A \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ implies

$$\left[\bar{y}a \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right| + \sigma_* \bar{c}p \left| \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right| \right] = \varsigma_k \left[\sigma_* \bar{d}q \left| \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ s \end{matrix} \right| + \bar{x}b \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ -s \end{matrix} \right\rangle \left\langle \begin{matrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{matrix} \right| \right]$$

where $\varsigma_k \doteq -\lambda_k^- / \lambda_k^+ = (-1)^k$. This equality can be valid for $k = 1, 2$ only if the operators in the squared brackets are equal to zero. Since $\mu_2 \neq \pm \bar{\mu}_2$ by the assumption $\theta_2 \neq 0, \pi$, it follows that $ya = cp = dq = xb = 0$. It is easy to see that this implies that x_1, z_2, z_3, y_4 are product vectors.

The similar argumentation shows incompatibility of the system (33)-(37) (by reducing to the case of tensor product vectors) if the pair (z_2, z_3) has form 3 and the pair (x_1, y_4) has form 1 or 2.

Assume finally that the pair (x_1, y_4) has form 4 , i.e.

$$x_1 = h \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mu_2 \\ t \end{bmatrix}, \; y_4 = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 \\ -s \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c \\ d \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mu}_2 \\ -t \end{bmatrix}, \quad s, t = \pm 1,$$

and the pair (z_2, z_3) is arbitrary. We will show that (33)-(35) imply that y_4 is a product vector. So, in fact the pair (x_1, y_4) has form 1 or 2.

Assume that y_4 is not a product vector and denote the vectors $[\mu_1, s]^\top$ and $[\mu_2, t]^\top$ by $|s\rangle$ and $|t\rangle$. In this notations $|x_1\rangle = h|s \otimes t\rangle$.

In case a) it follows from (34) and Lemma 10 in the Appendix that $|x_2\rangle = |p \otimes t\rangle$ for some vector $|p\rangle$. Hence the left hand side of (33) has the form

$$|h|^2 |s\rangle\langle s| \otimes |t\rangle\langle t| + |p\rangle\langle p| \otimes |t\rangle\langle t| = \left[|h|^2 |s\rangle\langle s| + |p\rangle\langle p| \right] \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|$$

and (33) implies $|y_4\rangle\langle y_4| \leq [|h|^2 |s\rangle\langle s| + |p\rangle\langle p|] \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|$. This operator inequality can be valid only if y_4 is a product vector.

In case b) it follows from (35) and Lemma 10 in the Appendix that $|x_3\rangle = |s \otimes q\rangle$ for some vector $|q\rangle$. Hence the left hand side of (33) has the form

$$|h|^2|s\rangle\langle s| \otimes |t\rangle\langle t| + |s\rangle\langle s| \otimes |q\rangle\langle q| = |s\rangle\langle s| \otimes \left[|h|^2|t\rangle\langle t| + |q\rangle\langle q|\right]$$

and similarly to the case a) we conclude that y_4 is a product vector.

By using the same argumentation exploiting (33)-(35) and Lemma 10 one can show that neither (x_1, y_4) nor (z_2, z_3) can be a pair of form 4 or 5 (not coinciding with form 1 or 2).

Thus, we have shown that the system (15)-(26) has no nontrivial solutions. This completes the proof of assertion C_2. □

Appendix

3.1 Proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4

Proof of Lemma 3. A) Let $\langle z_4| = [a, b, c, d]$ and

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} a & \gamma_2 b & \gamma_1 c & \gamma_1\gamma_2 d \\ b & a & \gamma_1 d & \gamma_1 c \\ c & \gamma_2 d & a & \gamma_2 b \\ d & c & b & a \end{bmatrix}, \quad S = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1\mu_2 & \mu_1\mu_2 & \mu_1\mu_2 & \mu_1\mu_2 \\ \mu_1 & -\mu_1 & \mu_1 & -\mu_1 \\ \mu_2 & \mu_2 & -\mu_2 & -\mu_2 \\ +1 & -1 & -1 & +1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mu_k = \sqrt{\gamma_k}$, $k = 1, 2$. By identifying $A \otimes B$ with the matrix $\|a_{ij}B\|$ the equalities $\langle z_4|U_k \otimes V_l|z_1\rangle = 0$, $k, l = 1, 2$ can be rewritten as the system of linear equations

$$W|z_1\rangle = 0 \tag{40}$$

and it is easy to see that $S^{-1}WS = \mathrm{diag}\{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4\}$, where

$$\begin{array}{ll} p_1 = a + \mu_2 b + \mu_1 c + \mu_1\mu_2 d, & p_2 = a - \mu_2 b + \mu_1 c - \mu_1\mu_2 d, \\ p_3 = a + \mu_2 b - \mu_1 c - \mu_1\mu_2 d, & p_4 = a - \mu_2 b - \mu_1 c + \mu_1\mu_2 d. \end{array} \tag{41}$$

So, system (40) can be rewritten as the system $p_k u_k = 0$, $k = \overline{1, 4}$, where $[u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4]^\top = S^{-1}|z_1\rangle$. Hence this system has nontrivial solutions if and only if $p_1p_2p_3p_4 = 0$ and

$$\{p_k = 0\} \Leftrightarrow \{W|q_k\rangle = 0\},$$

where $|q_k\rangle$ is the k-th column of the matrix S.

Thus, by choosing some of $p_1, \dots, p_4$ equal to zero we obtain all pairs (z_1, z_4) such that $\langle z_4|U_k \otimes V_l|z_1\rangle = 0,\ k, l = 1, 2$. We have

a) $C_4^2 = 6$ possibilities to take $p_k = p_l = 0$ and $p_i \neq 0,\ i \neq k, l$;

b) $C_4^1 = 4$ possibilities to take $p_k = 0$ and $p_i \neq 0,\ i \neq k$;

c) $C_4^3 = 4$ possibilities to take $p_k = p_l = p_j = 0$ and $p_i \neq 0,\ i \neq k, l, j$.

(the case $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = p_4 = 0$ means that $a = b = c = d = 0$, so it gives only trivial solution).

By identifying the vectors $x \otimes y$ and $[x_1 y, x_2 y]^\top$ it is easy to see that

$$|q_1\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}\mu_1\\1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\mu_2\\1\end{bmatrix},\ |q_2\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}\mu_1\\1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\mu_2\\-1\end{bmatrix},\ |q_3\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}\mu_1\\-1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\mu_2\\1\end{bmatrix},\ |q_4\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}\mu_1\\-1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\mu_2\\-1\end{bmatrix}$$

and that

$$p_1 = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |z_4\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}c_1\\c_2\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_2\\-1\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_1\\-1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}c_3\\c_4\end{bmatrix}, \quad c_1, \dots c_4 \in \mathbb{C},$$

$$p_2 = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |z_4\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}c_1\\c_2\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_2\\1\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_1\\-1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}c_3\\c_4\end{bmatrix}, \quad c_1, \dots c_4 \in \mathbb{C},$$

$$p_3 = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |z_4\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}c_1\\c_2\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_2\\-1\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_1\\1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}c_3\\c_4\end{bmatrix}, \quad c_1, \dots c_4 \in \mathbb{C},$$

$$p_4 = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |z_4\rangle = \begin{bmatrix}c_1\\c_2\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_2\\1\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\bar{\mu}_1\\1\end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix}c_3\\c_4\end{bmatrix}, \quad c_1, \dots c_4 \in \mathbb{C},$$

Hence the above six possibilities in a) correspond to cases 1)-3) in Lemma 3A (for example, the choice $p_1 = p_2 = 0,\ p_3, p_4 \neq 0$ corresponds to case 1) with $s = 1$), while the four possibilities in b) and in c) correspond respectively to cases 4) and 5).

B) Denote by W_x and W_y the above matrix W determined respectively via $z_4 = x_4$ and $z_4 = y_4$. Then the equalities in (23) and (24) can be rewritten as the system

$$W_x|y_1\rangle = W_y|x_1\rangle = 0, \qquad W_x|x_1\rangle = W_y|y_1\rangle = |c\rangle, \qquad |c\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^4. \qquad (42)$$

Since $S^{-1}W_xS = \mathrm{diag}\{p_1^x, p_2^x, p_3^x, p_4^x\}$ and $S^{-1}W_yS = \mathrm{diag}\{p_1^y, p_2^y, p_3^y, p_4^y\}$, where $p_1^x, p_2^x, p_3^x, p_4^x$ and $p_1^y, p_2^y, p_3^y, p_4^y$ are defined in (41) with $z_4 = x_4$ and $z_4 = y_4$ correspondingly, system (42) is equivalent to the following one

$$p_k^x v_k = p_k^y u_k = 0, \qquad p_k^x u_k = p_k^y v_k = \tilde{c}_k, \qquad k = \overline{1,4}, \tag{43}$$

where $[u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4]^\top = S^{-1}|x_1\rangle$, $[v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4]^\top = S^{-1}|y_1\rangle$ and $[\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_3, \tilde{c}_4]^\top = S^{-1}|c\rangle$. It follows that $\tilde{c}_k = 0$ for all k. Indeed, if $p_k^y \neq 0$ for some k then the first equality in (43) implies $u_k = 0$ and the second equality in (43) shows that $\tilde{c}_k = 0$. Hence $|c\rangle = S|\tilde{c}\rangle = 0$. □

Lemma 4 follows from Lemma 3 with γ_2 replaced by $\bar{\gamma}_2$.

3.2 Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma 8. *If* $|a\rangle\langle x| + |b\rangle\langle y| + |c\rangle\langle z| = 0$ *then either* $a \| b \| c$ *or* $x \| y \| z$.

Proof. We may assume that all the vectors are nonzero (since otherwise the assertion is trivial).

Let $p \perp x$. Then $\langle y|p\rangle|b\rangle + \langle z|p\rangle|c\rangle = 0$ and hence either $b \parallel c$ or $\langle y|p\rangle = \langle z|p\rangle = 0$.

If $b \parallel c$ then we have $|a\rangle\langle x| = -|b\rangle\langle y + \lambda z|$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, and hence $a \parallel b \parallel c$.

If $\langle y|p\rangle = \langle z|p\rangle = 0$ then $x \parallel y \parallel z$, since the vector p is arbitrary. □

Lemma 9. *The equality*

$$X_1 \otimes Y_1 + X_2 \otimes Y_2 = X_3 \otimes Y_3 + X_4 \otimes Y_4, \tag{44}$$

where $X_i = |x_i\rangle\langle x_i|$, $Y_i = |y_i\rangle\langle y_i|$, $i = \overline{1,4}$, *can be valid only in the following cases:*

1) $x_i \parallel x_j$ *for all* i, j *and* $Y_1\|x_1\|^2 + Y_2\|x_2\|^2 = Y_3\|x_3\|^2 + Y_4\|x_4\|^2$;

2) $y_i \parallel y_j$ *for all* i, j *and* $X_1\|y_1\|^2 + X_2\|y_2\|^2 = X_3\|y_3\|^2 + X_4\|y_4\|^2$;

3) $X_1 \otimes Y_1 = X_4 \otimes Y_4$ *and* $X_2 \otimes Y_2 = X_3 \otimes Y_3$;

4) $X_1 \otimes Y_1 = X_3 \otimes Y_3$ *and* $X_2 \otimes Y_2 = X_4 \otimes Y_4$.

Proof. We may assume that all the vectors x_i, y_i are nonzero (since otherwise the assertion is trivial).

Let $p \perp x_1$. By multiplying the both sides of (44) by $|p\rangle\langle p| \otimes I$ we obtain

$$|\langle x_2|p\rangle|^2 Y_2 = |\langle x_3|p\rangle|^2 Y_3 + |\langle x_4|p\rangle|^2 Y_4. \tag{45}$$

If $x_2 \parallel x_1$ then $\langle x_3|p\rangle = \langle x_4|p\rangle = 0$ and hence $x_1 \parallel x_2 \parallel x_3 \parallel x_4$, since the vector p is arbitrary. So, case 1) holds.

If $x_2 \nparallel x_1$ then one can choose p such that $\langle x_2|p\rangle \neq 0$. So, (45) implies that either $x_3 \nparallel x_1$ or $x_4 \nparallel x_1$. Thus, we have the following possibilities:

a) If $x_i \nparallel x_1$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$ then one can choose p such that $\langle x_i|p\rangle \neq 0$, $i = 2, 3, 4$, and (45) implies $y_2 \parallel y_3 \parallel y_4$. Hence (44) leads to $X_1 \otimes Y_1 = [\ldots] \otimes Y_2$, which gives $y_1 \parallel y_2$. So, we have $y_1 \parallel y_2 \parallel y_3 \parallel y_4$, i.e. case 2).

b) If $x_i \nparallel x_1$ for $i = 2, 3$ but $x_4 \parallel x_1$ then one can choose p such that $\langle x_i|p\rangle \neq 0$, $i = 2, 3$ and (45) implies $y_2 \parallel y_3$. So, we have $x_4 = \alpha x_1$ and $y_3 = \beta y_2$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. It follows from (44) that

$$X_1 \otimes [Y_1 - |\alpha|^2 Y_4] = [X_3|\beta|^2 - X_2] \otimes Y_2$$

and hence $Y_1 - |\alpha|^2 Y_4 = \lambda Y_2$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. If $\lambda \neq 0$ then Lemma 8 implies $y_1 \parallel y_2 \parallel y_3 \parallel y_4$, i.e. case 2) holds. If $\lambda = 0$ then $y_1 \parallel y_4$ and $x_2 \parallel x_3$. Thus we have

$$X_4 \otimes Y_4 = \gamma X_1 \otimes Y_1, \quad X_3 \otimes Y_3 = \delta X_2 \otimes Y_2, \quad \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{C}$$

and (44) implies $(1 - \gamma) X_1 \otimes Y_1 = (\delta - 1) X_2 \otimes Y_2$. Since $x_1 \nparallel x_2$, we have $\gamma = \delta = 1$, i.e. case 3) holds.

c) If $x_i \nparallel x_1$ for $i = 2, 4$ but $x_3 \parallel x_1$ then the similar arguments (with the permutation $3 \leftrightarrow 4$) shows that case 4) holds.

□

Lemma 10. *Let $U_1 = \mathrm{diag}\{1, \gamma\}$ and x, y be nonzero vectors in $\mathbb{C}^2$. If $\langle a|\, U_1 \otimes A|\, x \otimes y\rangle = \langle c|\, U_1 \otimes A|d\rangle$ for all $A \in \mathfrak{M}_2$ then either $|d\rangle = |z\rangle \otimes |y\rangle$ or $|c\rangle = |p\rangle \otimes |q\rangle$ for some vectors p, q, z in $\mathbb{C}^2$.*

Proof. By using the isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \ni u \otimes v \leftrightarrow [u_1 v, u_2 v]^\top \in \mathbb{C}^2 \oplus \mathbb{C}^2$ the condition of the lemma can be rewritten as follows

$$\left\langle \begin{array}{c|cc|c} a_1 & A & 0 & x_1 y \\ a_2 & 0 & \gamma A & x_2 y \end{array} \right\rangle = \left\langle \begin{array}{c|cc|c} c_1 & A & 0 & d_1 \\ c_2 & 0 & \gamma A & d_2 \end{array} \right\rangle, \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,$$

where a_1, a_2 are components of the vector a, etc. So, we have

$$x_1\langle a_1|A|y\rangle + x_2\gamma\langle a_2|A|y\rangle = \langle c_1|A|d_1\rangle + \gamma\langle c_2|A|d_2\rangle \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{M}_2,$$

which is equivalent to the equality $|y\rangle\langle\bar{x}_1 a_1 + \bar{x}_2\bar{\gamma}a_2| = |d_1\rangle\langle c_1| + \gamma|d_2\rangle\langle c_2|$. By Lemma 8 it follows that either $d_1 \parallel d_2 \parallel y$, which means that $|d\rangle = |z\rangle \otimes |y\rangle$, or $c_1 \parallel c_2$, which means that $|c\rangle = |p\rangle \otimes |q\rangle$. □

I am grateful to A.S.Holevo and to the participants of his seminar "Quantum probability, statistic, information" (the Steklov Mathematical Institute) for useful discussion.

References

[1] R.A.C.Medeiros and F.M. de Assis, "Quantum zero-error capacity", Int. J. Quant. Inf., 3, P.135, 2005.

[2] T.S.Cubitt, J. Chen, and A. W. Harrow, "Superactivation of the asymptotic zero-error classical capacity of a quantum channel", IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 57:12, P.8114, 2011; arXiv:0906.2547.

[3] T.S.Cubitt, G.Smith "An Extreme form of Superactivation for Quantum Zero-Error Capacities", arXiv:0912.2737.

[4] R. Duan, "Superactivation of zero-error capacity of noisy quantum channels", arXiv:0906.2527.

[5] R.Duan, S.Severini, A.Winter, "Zero-error communication via quantum channels, non-commutative graphs and a quantum Lovasz theta function", IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 59(2):1164-1174, 2013; arXiv:1002.2514.

[6] A.S.Holevo "Quantum systems, channels, information. A mathematical introduction", Berlin, DeGruyter, 2012.

[7] E.Knill, R.Laflamme "Theory of quantum error-correcting codes", Phys. Rev. A. 1997. V.55. P.900-911.

[8] M.A.Nielsen, I.L.Chuang "Quantum Computation and Quantum Information", Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[9] M.E.Shirokov, T.V.Shulman, "On superactivation of one-shot zero-error quantum capacity and the related property of quantum measurements", arXiv:1312.3586.

[10] M.E.Shirokov "On channels with positive quantum zero-error capacity having vanishing n-shot capacity", arXiv:1407.8524.

[11] G.Smith, J.A.Smolin, J.Yard, "Gaussian bosonic synergy: quantum communication via realistic channels of zero quantum capacity", Nature Photonics 5, P.624-627, 2011; arXiv:1102.4580.

[12] G.Smith, J.Yard, "Quantum comminication with zero-capacity channels", Science, 321, P.1812, 2008; arXiv:0807.4935.